## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

|    |    | T  | A 7 | $\overline{}$ | A 78 | T C |
|----|----|----|-----|---------------|------|-----|
| GR | Aι | Œυ | A   | 1)/           | AΝ   | AS. |

Plaintiff,

v. Case No. 11-14791 Honorable Patrick J. Duggan

MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC. and U.S. BANK,

| Defendants. |
|-------------|
|             |

## OPINION AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On or about September 28, 2011, Plaintiff filed this lawsuit against Defendants in the Circuit Court for Oakland County, Michigan, raising claims associated with the foreclosure of property in Rochester Hills, Michigan. Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on or about September 30, 2011; and Defendants removed the lawsuit to this Court based on diversity jurisdiction on October 31, 2011. On January 12, 2012, this Court issued an opinion and order dismissing Plaintiff's amended complaint pursuant to Defendants' motion, striking Plaintiff's "Amended Mass Joinder Complaint," and denying several motions filed by Plaintiff. On January 23, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration.

Rule 7.1 of the Local Rules for the Eastern District of Michigan provides that a motion for reconsideration only should be granted if the movant demonstrates that the Court and the parties have been misled by a palpable defect and that a different

disposition of the case must result from a correction of such a palpable defect. E.D.

Mich. LR 7.1h)(3). A motion that merely presents the same issues already ruled upon by

the Court shall not be granted. *Id*.

Plaintiff fails to set forth a palpable defect in the Court's decision, much less one

that, if corrected, would result in a different disposition of the case. She points out what

she believes are two factual errors in the Court's opinion and order (the reason U.S. Bank

postponed foreclosure of Plaintiff's residence in 2008 and the impact of her bankruptcy

and civil filings on the foreclosure process); however neither fact weighs on the outcome.

Plaintiff further claims that the Court rendered a decision before all defendants were

served. Plaintiff's amended complaint, however, named only Mortgage Electronic

Registration Systems, Inc. and U.S. Bank as defendants. To the extent Plaintiff named

other defendants in her "Amended Mass Joinder Complaint," the Court struck that

attempted amendment as it was filed without leave of court and because the proposed

amendments would be futile.

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED**, that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

Date: February 9, 2012

s/PATRICK J. DUGGAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies to:

Grace Ellis Adams

829 Langdon Court

Rochester Hills, MI 48037

Edward C. Cutlip, Jr., Esq.

Davidde A. Stella, Esq.

2